



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,137	01/18/2001	Lloyd Adams	JPM-052	7821
7590		12/17/2010	EXAMINER	
Intellectual Property Department Goodwin/Procter LLP 901 New York Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3691	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			12/17/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/765,137	Applicant(s) ADAMS ET AL.
	Examiner OLABODE AKINTOLA	Art Unit 3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2010.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 9-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-7 and 9-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/27/2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 3-6, 14-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riseman (US 7395239) in view of Lebda (US 6385594) in view of Norris (US 5870721).

Re claims 1 and 6: Riseman teaches a system and corresponding method for producing and sending a loan document to a customer, the system comprising: a web-enabled customer interface which receives loan information from the customer (col. 4, lines 37-51, fig. 1); a network coupled to the customer interface, the network receives the loan information from the customer interface (col. 4, line 52 through col. 5, line 17, fig. 1); a web site coupled to the network, the web site prompting the customer to enter the loan information, receiving the loan information and merging the loan information with a loan application form to produce a loan application (col. 4, lines 37 through col. 5, line 17, fig. 1); a loan processor computing system hosting the website and storing the loan application form, the loan processor computing system receiving the loan application, automatically performing a credit check on the customer based on the loan application, the loan processing computing system determining whether the is approved (col. 5, lines 31-40, col. 6, lines 20-23);

Riseman does not explicitly teach multiple branch terminals configured for receiving loan information at branch locations; a network coupled to the customer interface and the branch terminals;

Lebda teaches the concept of multiple lenders' terminals configured for receiving loan information at lender locations; a network coupled to the customer interface and the lender terminals (abstract, figures).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman to include this step as taught by Lebda for the obvious reason of making the loan information available to multiple lenders.

Riseman and Lebda do not teach the concept of performing a credit check by sending a loan application to a credit approval agency; a loan forms database storing forms used in the creation of loan documents and; a loan document creation server coupled to the loan processor computing system and the loan forms database, wherein the loan processor computing system, upon approving the loan application, automatically forwards the loan application to the loan document creation server, the loan document creation server generating and sending the loan document to the customer, based on the loan application and the accessed loan forms in the loan forms database, the loan document creation server sending the loan document to the customer through one of e-mail, facsimile, the network and a printer coupled to a network.

However, Riseman teaches that after the final approval of the loan, the remaining steps of the loan process are accomplished by traditional methods (col. 7, lines 23-35). Lebda further teaches the computer 100 dials to the credit bureau housed on computer 500 (equivalent of performing a credit check by sending a loan application to a credit approval agency) to obtain Fair Isaac Credit Score (Fig. 5, col. 4, lines 33-41).

Norris teaches the concept of performing credit check by sending a loan application to a credit approval agency (“neural network 17”)(col. 6, lines 8-45, fig. 1); a loan approval determination based on credit check; and generating and sending loan agreement and related documentation to the customer via facsimile (see at least abstract, col. 2, lines 13-15 and 35-39). Furthermore, Norris teaches if the user has a personal computer, modem and a printer, an “electronic file of the documents” can be transmitted to the user (col. 4, lines 61-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman and Lebda combination to include these features as taught by Norris for the obvious reason of

ensuring that the applicant is credit worthy and for speedy transmittal of all related and necessary documents between the lender and customer which are normally accomplished by traditional methods.

Re claim 3: Riseman teaches wherein: the network is the internet; and the customer interface is one of a computer, a personal digital assistant, and a loan application kiosk (fig. 1).

Re claim 4: Riseman does not explicitly teach, wherein the loan document includes at least one of a check and data relating to an electronic transfer of funds relating to the loan. However, Riseman teaches arranging for loan payments to be made automatically by electronic funds transfer (col. 7, lines 34-35). Norris teaches a loan documentation and electronic withdrawal from applicant's account to repay the loan (col. 2, lines 13-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman to include these features as taught by Norris for the obvious reason of establishing repayment method for the loan.

Re claims 5, 17-19: Riseman, Lebda and Norris combination does not explicitly teach, wherein the loan document includes insurance information relating to the loan, a loan approval letter, a loan promissory note, a loan contract. Official notice is hereby taken that including these documents as part of loan documentation is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman, Lebda and Norris

combination to include these documents for the obvious reason of providing the applicant with all the necessary documents regarding the loan as may be required by law.

Re claims 14-15: Riseman, Lebda and Norris combination teaches wherein the loan application is received by the loan processor computing system before the loan document is generated; wherein the loan application is produced before the loan document is generated (see claims 1 and 6 analyses, *supra*).

Re claim 20: Riseman, Lebda and Norris combination does not explicitly teach verifying a customer account by sending a test transaction; and sending funds to a customer account after the customer account is verified. Official notice is hereby taken that this concept is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman and Norris combination to include this feature for the obvious reason of verifying the customer account by allowing the lender to ensure that the account to which money is deposited actually belongs to the customer, thereby preventing fraud or error.

Claims 7-13 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riseman, Lebda and Norris as applied to claims 1-6, 14, 15 and 17-19 above, and further in view of Cohen et al (USPN 5740035).

Re claims 7 and 13: Riseman, Lebda and Norris teach all the claimed limitations as discussed above with respect to claims 1-6, 14, 15 and 17-19. Riseman, Lebda and Norris do not explicitly

teach analyzing the received loan information for completeness and prompting the customer if the received loan information is incomplete; sending a check to the customer, the check corresponding to the loan contract, receiving the check and cashing a check whereby cashing the check indicates acceptance by the customer of the terms listed in the loan document, checking the validity of the check. However, Riseman and Norris both teach electronic transfer of funds. Furthermore, Lebda teaches a validation check to make sure that the application is complete and correct (col. 3, lines 6-9).

Cohen teaches the concept of analyzing received information for completeness and prompting the user if the received information is incomplete (col. 4, lines 22-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman and Lebda to include this prompting the user when the received information is incomplete for the obvious reason of ensuring that all information necessary to process the application are received. Official notice is hereby taken that substituting EFT for a physical check and cashing the check to indicate acceptance by the customer of the terms listed in the loan document, checking the validity of the check and verifying the customer account by sending a test transaction are old and well known.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Riseman in view of Lebda in view of Norris to include these features. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow the customer to receive the funds and accept the loan by cashing the check.

Re claim 9: Riseman teaches wherein receiving loan information includes receiving the loan information over a network (fig. 1).

Re claim 10: Riseman teaches wherein: the network is the Internet; and receiving loan information includes receiving loan information from the customer through one of a computer, a personal digital assistant, and a loan application kiosk (fig. 1).

Re claims 11 and 12: Riseman and Norris combination teaches, wherein the sending of the loan document includes sending the loan document to the customer through one of e-mail, facsimile, the network, a first printer coupled to the network, another network, and a second printer coupled to the another network (see claims 1, 6 and 14-15 analyses, *supra*).

Re claim 16: Riseman and Norris combination teaches wherein the loan information is received before the loan document is generated (see claims 1 and 6 analyses, *supra*).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLABODE AKINTOLA whose telephone number is (571)272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Olabode Akintola/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691